

Serial No.: 10/808,266

PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No.: NC 96,202

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 14-21 and 38-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that the specification is enabling for “Ar is an independently selected divalent aromatic radical,” but not for “with or without substituents containing one or more fused aromatic rings, one or more non-fused aromatic rings without intervening functional groups, or combinations thereof wherein the radical sites are on the same or different aromatic rings.”

“Divalent aromatic radical” is a genus. The Examiner has admitted that the specification is enabling for the genus. Thus, the full genus is enabled including all species within the scope of the genus. The language that follows the genus lists certain sub-genera all within the scope of the genus. Thus, the sub-genera are also enabled by the specification.

Further, the Examiner stated the conclusion that the specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. However, no evidence is offered to support this conclusion. The Examiner has the burden of “making specific findings of fact, supported by the evidence, and then drawing conclusions based on these findings.” (MPEP 2164.04.) An enablement rejection may not be based solely on stating that the claim is not enabled.

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14-21 and 38-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Keller et al. (US 4,256,471).

The Examiner referred to a supposed amendment to claims 14 and 38 as raising new issues that would require further consideration and search (p. 2, lines 15-16). However, the claims were amended only by preliminary amendment before the first office action. The claims were not amended in Applicants' previous response. It is not clear which version of claims 14 and 38 are being examined.

Claim 14 is to a thermoset formed by curing a mixture comprising a phthalonitrile monomer  $C_6(CN)_2H_3-O-Ar-(O-Ar)_n-C_6(CN)_2H_3$ . Each Ar is an independently selected divalent aromatic radical with or without substituents containing one or more fused aromatic rings, one or more non-fused aromatic rings without intervening functional groups, or

Serial No.: 10/808,266

PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No.: NC 96,202

combinations thereof wherein the radical sites are on the same or different aromatic rings.  $n$  is an even integer greater than or equal to 2.

Keller discloses a thermoset made from  $C_6(CN)_2H_3-(O-\phi)_x-O-C_6(CN)_2H_3$  and states that this phthalonitrile may be made by reacting an aromatic diol with 4-nitrophthalonitrile.  $x$  is from 1 to 10, corresponding to a  $n$  of 0 to 9.

The reference is not enabling for all values of  $x$ . "Where a process for making the compound is not developed until after the date of invention, the mere naming of a compound in a reference, without more, cannot constitute a description of the compound." MPEP 2121.02, citing *In re Hoeksema*, 158 U.S.P.Q 596, 399 F.2d 269 (C.C.P.A 1968). The reference merely states that the aromatic diols are easily made by an Ullman ether synthesis, and cites to Williams, et al. and Hammann et al. (both attached) for further information (col. 3, line 68-col. 4, line 8). The examples in Keller only disclose the use of compounds having  $x = 1$  and 2 ( $n = 0$  and 1), and no syntheses of aromatic diols are disclosed. Williams and Hammann do not disclose any aromatic diols at all, only short chains of aryl groups without the hydroxide groups needed to form the phthalonitrile. Since the instant claim requires that  $n$  be at least 2, none of the claimed compounds are enabled by Keller.

Also attached is the declaration of Teddy M. Keller stating his expert opinion that the Ullmann ether synthesis cannot be used to make oligomeric or polymeric aryl ethers in high yield and high molecular weight.

The Examiner stated that the declaration is not commensurate with the scope of the claims. It was not stated what part of the claim was not covered by the declaration. The declaration states that "the Ullmann ether synthesis referred to in the Keller reference (US Patent No. 4,259,471) cannot be used to make oligomeric or polymeric aryl ethers in high yield and high molecular weight." (Paragraph 3.) Thus, the scope of the declaration covers all polymeric aryl ethers. Claims 14 and 38 recite phthalonitriles made from polymeric aryl ethers. Thus the declaration is commensurate with the scope of the claims.

Claims 15-21 depend from and contain all the limitations of claim 14 and are asserted to distinguish from the reference in the same manner as claim 14. Further, as to claim 16, the specific values of  $n$  are not disclosed in the reference.

As to claims 20 and 21, these claims recite that the polymerization mixture further comprises other phthalonitriles. Keller does not disclose copolymerizing the disclosed

Serial No.: 10/808,266

PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No.: NC 96,202

phthalonitrile with other phthalonitriles.

Claim 38 is to a method of making a thermoset comprising curing a mixture comprising the phthalonitrile recited in claim 14.

As explained above, the recited phthalonitrile is not enabled by the reference. Claims 39-46 depend from and contain all the limitations of claim 38 and are asserted to distinguish from the reference in the same manner as claim 14.

Claims 47-56 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Keller et al. (US 5,352,760) or Keller et al. (US 5,464,926).

Claim 47 is to a process of preparing a thermoset comprising reacting an excess of dihydroxyaromatic with a dihaloaromatic in the presence of a copper compound and a base, reacting a 3- or 4-nitrophthalonitrile with the product of the previous step, and curing a mixture comprising the product of the previous step.

Keller discloses reacting a dihydroxyaromatic with a dihaloaromatic in the presence of a base, reacting a 3- or 4-nitrophthalonitrile with the product of the previous step, and curing a mixture comprising the product of the previous step.

In order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, each claim limitation must be disclosed in the references. None of the references discloses the limitation in claim 47 that the reaction is performed in the presence of a copper compound. The Examiner cited to col. 6, line 48 of '760 as disclosing the copper compound. However, this copper compound is a curing agent in the final step of converting the phthalonitrile to a thermoset (col. 6, lines 34-36). The copper is not present when reacting the dihydroxyaromatic with a dihaloaromatic. The significance of the copper in the present invention is that it allows for the reaction without an activating group in the reactants. In Keller, the dihaloaromatic contains an R group that is an electron-withdrawing group. The reaction disclosed in Keller would not occur without the electron-withdrawing group. As all the claim limitations of claim 47 are not disclosed in the references, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made.

The Examiner stated that Applicants' arguments were based on the presence of a copper compound, but that this was not persuasive since it is not commensurate with the scope of the claims and since the products of the references had been formed in the absence of a copper compound in the first step. First, since claim 47 recites "wherein the reaction is performed in the

Serial No.: 10/808,266

PATENT APPLICATION

Docket No.: NC 96,202

presence of a copper compound," the argument is commensurate with the scope of the claim.

Both the claim and the argument are directed to the presence of copper.

Second, the Examiner admitted that the references do not disclose a copper compound in the first step (p.3, lines 8-9) as recited in claim 47.

Claims 48-56 depend from and contain all the limitations of claim 47 and are asserted to distinguish from the references in the same manner as claim 47.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

In the event that a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0281, and in the event that there is a credit due, please credit Deposit Account No. 50-0281.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph T. Grunkemeyer

Reg. No. 46,746

Phone No. 202-404-1556

Office of the Associate Counsel

(Patents), Code 1008.2

Naval Research Laboratory

4555 Overlook Ave, SW

Washington, DC 20375-5325